



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trudemark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandra, Vignia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE 09/460,292 12/10/1999		FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO 2313	
		David J. Mangelsdorf	UTSD:596		
7:	590 09/25/2003				
Steven L. Highlander FULBRIGHT & JAWORSKI LLP 600 Congress Avenue, Suite 2400			EXAMINER		
			WOITACH, JOSEPH T		
Austin, TX 78701			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1632	30	
			DATE MAILED: 09/25/2003	DATE MAILED: 09/25/2003	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<u> </u>		1	/ \		
	,		Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Advisory Action			09/460,292	MANGELSDORF E	T AL.
			Examiner	Art Unit	
			Joseph T. Woitach	1632	
Th MAILI	NG DATE of this co	mmunication app	ars on the cover sheet with the co	orrespondence add	Iress
final rejection under	tion by the applical 37 CFR 1.113 may ce; (2) a timely filed n compliance with	nt is required to av only be either: (1) d Notice of Appeal 37 CFR 1.114.	LICATION IN CONDITION FOR roid abandonment of this applica a timely filed amendment whicl (with appeal fee); or (3) a timel	ation. A proper repl h places the applica	ation in
		PERIOD FOR RE	EPLY [check either a) or b)]		
b) The period for no event, how ONLY CHECK 706.07(f).	reply expires on: (1) the ever, will the statutory p THIS BOX WHEN TH	e mailing date of this A period for reply expire I E FIRST REPLY WAS	g date of the final rejection. Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailin FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF TH	g date of the final reject HE FINAL REJECTION.	ion. See MPEP
fee have been filed is the fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a)	date for purposes of de is calculated from: (1) re, if checked. Any rep	etermining the period of the expiration date of ly received by the Office	date on which the petition under 37 CF of extension and the corresponding amount the shortened statutory period for reply be later than three months after the main EFR 1.704(b).	ount of the fee. The apportion of the final originally set in the final	ropriate extension Office action; or
,			ellant's Brief must be filed within R 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal o	•	in
2. The proposed	amendment(s) will	I not be entered be	ecause:		
(a) 🛛 they raise	new issues that w	ould require furthe	er consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);	
(b) 🗌 they raise	the issue of new r	matter (see Note b	elow);		
	not deemed to plac appeal; and/or	e the application in	n better form for appeal by mate	rially reducing or si	mplifying the
(d) 🗌 they pres	sent additional clair	ns without canceli	ng a corresponding number of f	inally rejected claim	ıs.
NOTE: <u>s</u>	See Continuation She	<u>eet</u> .			
3. Applicant's re	oly has overcome t	he following reject	ion(s):		
	ed or amended clai non-allowable clai		be allowable if submitted in a se	eparate, timely filed	amendment
			reconsideration has been consi e Continuation Sheet	dered but does NO	T place the
	r exhibit will NOT b		ause it is not directed SOLELY t	o issues which wer	e newly
			(s) a)⊠ will not be entered or bj ould be rejected is provided belo		and an
The status of	he claim(s) is (or w	vill be) as follows:			
Claim(s) allov	ved:				
· ·	cted to:				
Claim(s) reject	ted: <u>1,2,4-14,21,23</u>	-27,29,44 and 45.			
, , ,	drawn from conside				
· ·			a) approved or b) disapp	roved by the Exam	iner.
	•	·	nt(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s).	•	•
 10. Other:			SUP	DEBORAH J. REYNOU BRVISORY PATENT EUR ECHANOLOGY CENTER	epole Simen
			•	-~ =vocual CONICH]	וסטט

^e Continuation Sheet (PTOL-303)





Application No. 009/460,292

Continuation of 2. NOTE: the amendment to recite the LXRalpha 'polypeptide' can not respond to dietary cholesterol raises new issues under 35 USC 112, first paragraph regarding enablement and written description for such a peptide as supported by the instant specification. Further, Applicants do not point to any specific support for the amendment raising consideration of new matter..

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: To the extent that Applicants' arguments apply to the instantly pending claims, Examiner agrees that the specification enables use of both heterozygous and homzygous alterations. However, it is only the disruption(s) of the LXR gene which results in a decreased amount of the LXRalpha protein which produce the enabled and usable phenotype. Additionally, Examiner would agree that any phenotype resulting from decreased expression of LXRalpha would be inherent to said transgenic mouse, however the only particular phenotypes provided for use in the present specification are cholesterol accumulation, increased bile acid synthesis and hepatomegally. To this end, the metods drawn to these phenotypes would be fully enabled, however are subject the rejection because the breadth of the mouse provided as a starting material. The present disclosure provides for the correlation between decreased amounts of the LXRalpha protein and specific particlar phenotypes in transgenic mice, however fails to provide adequate support for any alteration and any possible phenotype resulting therefrom.